arXiv:1408.6273v1 [cs.CC] 26 Aug 2014

On symmetries of the Strassen algorithm

Vladimir P.Burichenko

Institute of mathematics of Academy of Sciences of Belarus
Kirov Street 32a, Gomel 246000, Republic of Belarus
vpburich@gmail.com

Abstract

We consider the famous Strassen algorithm for fast multiplication of matrices. We show that this algorithm has a nontrivial finite group of automorphisms of order 36 (namely the direct product of two copies of the symmetric group on 3 symbols), or even 72, if we consider "extended" Strassen algorithm. This is an indirect evidence that the (unknown at present) optimal algorithm for multiplication of two size 3 by 3 matrices also may have a large automorphisms group, and this may be a fruitful idea for a search of such an algorithm. In the beginning we give a brief introduction to the subject, to make the text accessible for specialists in the representation theory of finite groups.

Keywords: Strassen algorithm, matrix multiplication.

1. Strassen algorithm. This text deals with the fast algorithms for matrix multiplication.

The usual algorithm ("multiplying of a row by a column") needs N^3 multiplications and $N^3 - N^2$ additions to multiply two $N \times N$ matrices, total $O(N^3)$ arithmetical operations. In 1968 V.Strassen [1] discovered another approach, which is now widely known.

Let R be a (non-commutative) ring,

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad B = \begin{pmatrix} b_{11} & b_{12} \\ b_{21} & b_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

be two 2×2 matrices over R, and let

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11}b_{11} + a_{12}b_{21} & a_{11}b_{12} + a_{12}b_{22} \\ a_{21}b_{11} + a_{22}b_{21} & a_{21}b_{12} + a_{22}b_{22} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} c_{11} & c_{12} \\ c_{21} & c_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

be their product. Then we can compute C with only 7 multiplications in R (but at price of 18 additions). Namely, consider the following products:

$$p_1 = a_{11}(b_{12} + b_{22}), \quad p_2 = (a_{11} - a_{12})b_{22}, \quad p_3 = (-a_{21} + a_{22})b_{11},$$

$$p_4 = a_{22}(b_{11} + b_{21}), \quad p_5 = (a_{11} + a_{22})(b_{11} + b_{22}),$$

$$p_6 = (a_{11} + a_{21})(b_{11} - b_{12}), \quad p_7 = (a_{12} + a_{22})(b_{21} - b_{22}).$$

Then it is easy to see that

$$c_{11} = -p_2 - p_4 + p_5 + p_7, \quad c_{12} = p_1 - p_2, \quad c_{21} = -p_3 + p_4,$$

$$c_{22} = -p_1 - p_3 + p_5 - p_6.$$

Now let A and B be two $2^n \times 2^n$ matrices over R. We consider them as 2×2 matrices over the ring $S = M_{2^{n-1}}(R)$. So one can multiply A and B using 7 multiplications and 18 additions in S. Applying the same method recursively to compute products in S, we can see that it suffices 7^n multiplications and $6(7^n - 4^n)$ additions in R to multiply A and B.

Further, let $N \geq 1$ be arbitrary natural number and take the smallest k such that $2^k \geq N$. Clearly, the number of operations needed to multiply two $N \times N$ matrices does not exceed such a number for $2^k \times 2^k$ matrices. Therefore we can multiply two $N \times N$ matrices using $O(N^{\log_2 7}) = O(N^{2.81})$ arithmetical operations.

2. Motivation of the work. It is natural that Strassen's idea has lead to numerous investigations in various directions. The author would like to mention survey [2] and lecture notes [3]. The best estimate for the number of operations known at the moment is $O(N^{2.323})$; it is mentioned in a talk of V.Strassen [4]. However, the constants in such estimates are large, and the corresponding algorithms are mainly of theoretical interest.

On the other hand, it is not much known about the complexity of multiplication of matrices of given "small" formats. Let $R(m, n, p)$ be the number of multiplications needed to multiply $m \times n$ matrix (over a *non-commutative* algebra) by a $n \times p$ matrix. It is known that $R(m, n, p)$ is symmetric in m, n, p and that
$R(2, 2, 2) = 7$ [5],
$R(2, 2, 3) = 11$ [6],
$R(2, 2, 4) = 14$ [7],
$14 \leq R(2, 3, 3) \leq 15$ (see [9] and [8] for lower and upper estimates, respectively), and
$19 \leq R(3, 3, 3) \leq 23$ ([9] and [10], respectively).

The author believes that at the moment it is important, both from theoretical and practical viewpoint, to find the precise value of $R(3, 3, 3)$, and, moreover, to determine the variety of optimal (i.e. with minimal number of multiplications) algorithms in the cases $(m, n, p) = (2, 2, 3)$, $(2, 2, 4)$, $(2, 3, 3)$, $(3, 3, 3)$ (for $(2, 2, 2)$ this variety is determined in [11], see the details below).

Now we can describe the motivation for the present work as follows.

- We show that the Strassen algorithm has rather large (of order 36 or even 72, depending on the viewpoint) group of automorphisms;
- this is an indirect evidence that the (unknown at present) optimal algorithm for the case $(m, n, p) = (3, 3, 3)$ has a large group of automorphisms also,

and therefore

- to assume in advance that the above mentioned optimal algorithm *must* have a large group of automorphisms may be a fruitful idea in the *search* of such an algorithm; this may be a good problem for specialists in finite linear groups.

3. Decomposable tensors, rank, and Segre isomorphisms. Let

$$\widetilde{V} = V_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes V_n$$

be the tensor product of several spaces over a field K. The elements of $\widetilde{V}$ of the form $v_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes v_n$, $v_i \in V_i$, are called *decomposable tensors*. For an element $t \in \widetilde{V}$ let $\mathrm{rk}(t) = r$ be the minimal number such that $t = t_1 + \ldots + t_r$, where $t_1, \ldots, t_r$ are decomposable. Thus, the tensors of rank 1 are precisely the decomposable tensors.

The set of all decomposable tensors in $\widetilde{V}$ is a cone, closed in the Zariski topology. We shall call it the *Segre variety* (usually, however, this term is used for the *projectivization* of this cone).

Let $\widetilde{U} = U_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes U_m$ be another product of spaces. Then by a *Segre isomorphism* we mean an isomorphism of linear spaces $\varphi : \widetilde{U} \longrightarrow \widetilde{V}$ which maps the Segre variety in $\widetilde{U}$ bijectively to the Segre variety in $\widetilde{V}$.

If $m = n$, τ an arbitrary permutation on $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $\dim U_i = \dim V_{\tau(i)}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, and $\alpha_i : U_i \longrightarrow V_{\tau(i)}$ are isomorphisms, then there exists a unique isomorphism $\varphi : \widetilde{U} \longrightarrow \widetilde{V}$ such that

$$\varphi(u_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes u_n) = \alpha_{\tau^{-1}(1)}(u_{\tau^{-1}(1)}) \otimes \ldots \otimes \alpha_{\tau^{-1}(n)}(u_{\tau^{-1}(n)}), \qquad \forall\, u_i \in U_i\,,$$

and this isomorphism is a Segre isomorphism.

Proposition 1 *If the field K is infinite and $\dim U_i$, $\dim V_j > 1$ for all i, j, then any Segre isomorphism $\varphi : \widetilde{U} \longrightarrow \widetilde{V}$ has the described form.*

Proof. First note the following. We say that two decomposable tensors

$$u = u_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes u_m, \qquad v = v_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes v_m \in \widetilde{U}$$

are *adjacent*, if $\langle u \rangle \neq \langle v \rangle$ and $\langle u_i \rangle \neq \langle v_i \rangle$ for exactly one index i. It is easy to see that u and v are adjacent if and only if $\langle u \rangle \neq \langle v \rangle$ and each element of $\langle u, v \rangle$ is decomposable.

Now suppose that $\varphi : \widetilde{U} \longrightarrow \widetilde{V}$ is a Segre isomorphism. It follows from the previous remark that φ takes adjacent tensors to adjacent ones.

Take arbitrary element $u = u_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes u_m \in \widetilde{U}$. Let $v = \varphi(u)$, $v = v_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes v_n \in \widetilde{V}$. The set of all w adjacent to u coincides with the union of subspaces

$$R_i = u_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes u_{i-1} \otimes U_i \otimes u_{i+1} \otimes \ldots \otimes u_m\,.$$

If $i \neq j$, then $R_i \cap R_j = \langle u \rangle$. Similarly, the set of all z, adjacent to v, coincides with the union of subspaces

$$L_j = v_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes v_{j-1} \otimes V_j \otimes v_{j+1} \otimes \ldots \otimes v_n\,.$$

Since φ is a Segre isomorphism, it maps $\cup_{i=1}^m R_i$ bijectively to $\cup_{j=1}^n L_j$. Since $R_i \cap R_j = \langle u \rangle$ and $L_i \cap L_j = \langle v \rangle$ when $i \neq j$, it follows that $m = n$ and there exists a permutation τ such that $\varphi(R_i) = L_{\tau(i)}$, whence $\dim R_i = \dim L_{\tau(i)}$, $i = 1, \ldots, m$. Therefore, $\dim U_i = \dim V_{\tau(i)}$.

We may assume without loss of generality (the details are left to the reader), that τ is the identity. Therefore, there exist isomorphisms $\alpha_i : U_i \longrightarrow V_i$ such that φ maps

$$u_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes u_{i-1} \otimes u \otimes u_{i+1} \otimes \ldots \otimes u_n$$

to

$$v_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes v_{i-1} \otimes \alpha_i(u) \otimes v_{i+1} \otimes \ldots \otimes v_n \,,$$

for all $u \in U_i$.

It remains to prove that

$$\varphi(t_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes t_n) = \alpha_1(t_1) \otimes \ldots \otimes \alpha_n(t_n) \qquad \forall\ (t_1, \ldots, t_n) \in U_1 \times \ldots \times U_n.$$

We argue by induction on the number l of indices i such that $\langle t_i \rangle \neq \langle u_i \rangle$.

Notice that $\alpha_i(u_i) = v_i$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$, so for $l = 0$ the claim is true. For $l = 1$ it is true also, by previous consruction.

Suppose $l = 2$; for example, let $\langle t_1 \rangle \neq \langle u_1 \rangle$, $\langle t_2 \rangle \neq \langle u_2 \rangle$, and $t_i = u_i$ for $i \geq 3$. The tensors $t_1 \otimes u_2 \otimes u_3 \otimes \ldots \otimes u_n$ and $u_1 \otimes t_2 \otimes u_3 \otimes \ldots \otimes u_n$ are adjacent to $t_1 \otimes t_2 \otimes u_3 \otimes \ldots \otimes u_n$. So $\varphi(t_1 \otimes t_2 \otimes u_3 \otimes \ldots \otimes u_n)$ is adjacent to

$$\varphi(t_1 \otimes u_2 \otimes \ldots \otimes u_n) = \alpha_1(t_1) \otimes v_2 \otimes \ldots \otimes v_n$$

and to

$$\varphi(u_1 \otimes t_2 \otimes u_3 \otimes \ldots \otimes u_n) = v_1 \otimes \alpha_2(t_2) \otimes v_3 \otimes \ldots \otimes v_n \,.$$

Therefore, $\varphi(t_1 \otimes t_2 \otimes u_3 \otimes \ldots \otimes u_n)$ is proportional to

$$\alpha_1(t_1) \otimes \alpha_2(t_2) \otimes v_3 \otimes \ldots \otimes v_n \,.$$

As this is true for all $t_1 \otimes t_2 \in U_1 \otimes U_2$, the proportionality coefficient does not depend on t_1, t_2, and so equals 1.

The same argument works for other cases with $l = 2$.

Finally, let $l \geq 3$, for example let $\langle t_1 \rangle \neq \langle u_1 \rangle$, $\langle t_2 \rangle \neq \langle u_2 \rangle$, $\langle t_3 \rangle \neq \langle u_3 \rangle$, and $t_i = u_i$ for $i \geq 4$. Then it suffices to observe that

$$\varphi(t_1 \otimes t_2 \otimes t_3 \otimes u_4 \otimes \ldots \otimes u_n)$$

must be adjacent to

$$\varphi(u_1 \otimes t_2 \otimes t_3 \otimes u_4 \otimes \ldots \otimes u_n) = v_1 \otimes \alpha_2(t_2) \otimes \alpha_3(t_3) \otimes v_4 \otimes \ldots \otimes v_n$$

and to

$$\varphi(t_1 \otimes u_2 \otimes t_3 \otimes u_4 \otimes \ldots \otimes u_n) = \alpha_1(t_1) \otimes v_2 \otimes \alpha_3(t_3) \otimes v_4 \otimes \ldots \otimes v_n \,.$$

The details are left to the reader. $\square$

We need another important concept. Let $t \in \widetilde{V}$ be an arbitrary tensor. The *isotropy group* $\Gamma(t)$ is the group of all automorphisms $\widetilde{A}$ of $\widetilde{V}$ of the form $\widetilde{A} = A_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes A_n$, $A_i \in GL(V_i)$, such that $\widetilde{A}(t) = t$. The *extended isotropy group* $\widetilde{\Gamma}(t)$ is the group of all Segre automorphisms φ of $\widetilde{V}$ such that $\varphi(t) = t$. Hence $\Gamma(t) \trianglelefteq \widetilde{\Gamma}(t)$, and $\widetilde{\Gamma}(t)/\Gamma(t)$ is a subgroup in S_n (where S_n is the symmetric group on n letters).

4. Algorithms and decomposable tensors. Note that the Strassen algorithm may be expressed by the following formula:

$$\begin{aligned}\begin{pmatrix} x_{11} & x_{12} \\ x_{21} & x_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} y_{11} & y_{12} \\ y_{21} & y_{22} \end{pmatrix} &= x_{11}(y_{12}+y_{22}) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &+ (x_{11}-x_{12})y_{22} \begin{pmatrix} -1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + (-x_{21}+x_{22})y_{11} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &+ x_{22}(y_{11}+y_{21}) \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + (x_{11}+x_{22})(y_{11}+y_{22}) \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &+ (x_{11}+x_{21})(-y_{12}+y_{11}) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} + (x_{12}+x_{22})(y_{21}-y_{22}) \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

The formulae of this kind are related to decompositions of the structure tensors of maps.

Below K denotes an infinite field of characteristic 0, and R a (non-commutative) algebra over K.

Recall that to a bilinear map $f : U \times V \longrightarrow W$, where U, V and W are spaces, there corresponds a *structure tensor* $\overline{f} \in U^* \otimes V^* \otimes W$. For example, let $U = M_{m\times n}(K)$, $V = M_{n\times p}(K)$ and $W = M_{m\times p}(K)$ be the matrix spaces. The basis of $M_{a\times b}(K)$ is $\{e_{ij} \mid 1 \le i \le a,\ 1 \le j \le b\}$, where e_{ij} are the usual matrix units. By $\{e'_{ij}\}$ we denote the dual basis of $(M_{a\times b}(K))^*$, that is $(e'_{ij}, e_{kl}) = \delta_{ik}\delta_{jl}$. Let $\mu : U \times V \longrightarrow W$ be the usual multiplication of matrices, then its structure tensor equals

$$\overline{\mu} = \sum_{i,j,k} e'_{ij} \otimes e'_{jk} \otimes e_{ik},$$

where the sum is over all $1 \le i \le m$, $1 \le j \le n$, $1 \le k \le p$.

Suppose that $\overline{\mu}$ can be represented as a sum of r decomposable tensors:

$$\overline{\mu} = \sum_{i=1}^{r} u_i \otimes v_i \otimes w_i,$$

$u_i \in U^*$ $(= M_{m\times n}(K)^*)$, $v_i \in V^*$, $w_i \in W$. Then there exists an algorithm, that computes the product of $m \times n$ and $n \times p$ matrices over R that needs r multiplications in R. For $a, b \in \mathbf{N}$ define *convolution*

$$(,) \ : \ M_{a\times b}(R) \times M_{a\times b}(K)^* \longrightarrow R$$

by

$$(\sum r_{ij}e_{ij}, \sum x_{ij}e'_{ij}) = \sum x_{ij}r_{ij},$$

where $r_{ij} \in R$, $x_{ij} \in K$, and the sums are taken over $i = 1, \dots, a$, $j = 1, \dots, b$. Now it is possible to prove that for arbitrary $A \in M_{m\times n}(R)$, $B \in M_{n\times p}(R)$

$$AB = \sum_{i=1}^{r} (A, u_i)(B, v_i)w_i\,. \tag{2}$$

Example. Let $m = n = p = 2$, then the tensor

$$\overline{\mu} = \sum_{i,j,k=1,2} e'_{ij} \otimes e'_{jk} \otimes e_{ik}$$

can be represented as

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\mu} &= e'_{11}\otimes(e'_{12}+e'_{22})\otimes(e_{12}-e_{22})+(e'_{11}-e'_{12})\otimes e'_{22}\otimes(-e_{11}-e_{12})\\ &+ (-e'_{21}+e'_{22})\otimes e'_{11}\otimes(-e_{21}-e_{22})+e'_{22}\otimes(e'_{11}+e'_{21})\otimes(-e_{11}+e_{21})\\ &+ (e'_{11}+e'_{22})\otimes(e'_{11}+e'_{22})\otimes(e_{11}+e_{22})+(e'_{11}+e'_{21})\otimes(-e'_{12}+e'_{11})\otimes(-e_{22})\\ &+ (e'_{12}+e'_{22})\otimes(e'_{21}-e'_{22})\otimes e_{11}.\end{aligned}$$

Applying the described construction to this decomposition, we obtain formula (1).

The proof of the formula (2) in the general case is left to the interested reader.

Note that the tensor $\overline{\mu}$ is equivalent (under some Segre isomorphism) to a certain tensor that can be represented in a rather symmetric form.

Denote $M_{ab}=M_{a\times b}(K)$, for brevity. Consider isomorphisms $M^*_{mn}\longrightarrow M_{mn}$, $M^*_{np}\longrightarrow M_{np}$, $M_{mp}\longrightarrow M_{pm}$ defined by $e'_{ij}\mapsto e_{ij}$, $e'_{jk}\mapsto e_{jk}$, $e_{ik}\mapsto e_{ki}$ respectively. Let

$$\varphi : M^*_{mn}\otimes M^*_{np}\otimes M_{mp}\longrightarrow M_{mn}\otimes M_{np}\otimes M_{pm}$$

be the corresponding Segre isomorphism. Then $\varphi(\overline{\mu})=S(m,n,p)$, where

$$S(m,n,p)=\sum e_{ij}\otimes e_{jk}\otimes e_{ki}\,,$$

the sum is again over $1\le i\le m$, $1\le j\le n$, $1\le k\le p$.

Thus we have the following

Proposition 2 *The minimal number of multiplications needed to multiply $m\times n$ matrix (with non-commuting entries) by a $n\times p$ matrix equals the rank of $S(m,n,p)$.*

This proposition is more or less known (I have no precise reference, but cf. the exercises in the last section of the textbook [12]).

By application of the isomorphism φ to the decomposition for $\overline{\mu}$, described in the example, we obtain decomposition

$$\begin{aligned}S(2,2,2) &= \sum_{i,j,k=1,2} e_{ij}\otimes e_{jk}\otimes e_{ki} = e_{11}\otimes(e_{12}+e_{22})\otimes(e_{21}-e_{22})\\ &+ (e_{11}-e_{12})\otimes e_{22}\otimes(-e_{11}-e_{21})+(-e_{21}+e_{22})\otimes e_{11}\otimes(-e_{12}-e_{22})\\ &+ e_{22}\otimes(e_{11}+e_{21})\otimes(-e_{11}+e_{12})+(e_{11}+e_{22})\otimes(e_{11}+e_{22})\otimes(e_{11}+e_{22})\\ &+ (e_{11}+e_{21})\otimes(-e_{12}+e_{11})\otimes(-e_{22})+(e_{12}+e_{22})\otimes(e_{21}-e_{22})\otimes e_{11}.\end{aligned}\qquad(3)$$

5. Group actions on algorithms. Let $t\in V_1\otimes\ldots\otimes V_l$ be an arbitrary tensor. An *algorithm computing* t is a set $\{t_1,\ldots,t_n\}$ of decomposable tensors such that $t_1+\ldots+t_n=t$. For example,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S} &= \{e_{11}\otimes(e_{12}+e_{22})\otimes(e_{21}-e_{22}),\\ &\quad (e_{11}-e_{12})\otimes e_{22}\otimes(-e_{11}-e_{21}),\ (-e_{21}+e_{22})\otimes e_{11}\otimes(-e_{12}-e_{22}),\\ &\quad e_{22}\otimes(e_{11}+e_{21})\otimes(-e_{11}+e_{12}),\ (e_{11}+e_{22})\otimes(e_{11}+e_{22})\otimes(e_{11}+e_{22}),\\ &\quad (e_{11}+e_{21})\otimes(-e_{12}+e_{11})\otimes(-e_{22}),\ (e_{12}+e_{22})\otimes(e_{21}-e_{22})\otimes e_{11}\ \}\end{aligned}$$

is an algorithm (which is, of course, called *Strassen algorithm*) computing $S(2,2,2)$.

It is evident that the extended isotropy group $\widetilde{\Gamma}(t)$ acts on the set of all algorithms computing t (in particular, on the set of all optimal algorithms). The *automorphism group* of algorithm $\{t_1,\ldots,t_n\}$ is the subgroup of all elements $\varphi\in\widetilde{\Gamma}(t)$ preserving $\{t_1,\ldots,t_n\}$.

Theorem 3 *Let $t = S(2,2,2)$. Then the isotropy group $\Gamma(t)$ acts transitively on the set of all optimal algorithms computing t.*

This theorem is due to de Groote [11]. It should be mentioned that there are vague places in [11], in particular in the proofs of Propositions 2.9 and 2.10; but the author found an independent proof of the theorem.

One of the main results of the present work is the following

Theorem 4 *The automorphism group of the Strassen algorithm is a finite group isomorphic to $S_3 \times S_3$.*

(In fact, the concept of the "automorphism group of an algorithm" admits some extension, which will be explained below).

6. Some authomophisms of the Strassen algorithm. In this paragraph we describe some authomorphisms of the Strassen algorithm. First we give a formal proof, and then explain the origin of the athomorphisms.

Any authomorphism of the Strassen algorithm is, by definition, a Segre authomorphism of the product $M_2 \otimes M_2 \otimes M_2$, where $M_2 = M_{22} = M_2(K)$.

Proposition 5 *Let $T_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$, $T_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, and let Φ_i be the transformation of M_2 defined by $\Phi_i(x) = T_i x T_i^{-1}$. Define $\rho : M_2 \longrightarrow M_2$ by*

$$\rho(\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}) = \begin{pmatrix} d & -b \\ -c & a \end{pmatrix}.$$

Next, let A_1, A_2, B_1 and B_2 be the Segre authomorphisms of the product $M_2 \otimes M_2 \otimes M_2$ defined by

$$A_1(x \otimes y \otimes z) = y \otimes z \otimes x\,,$$
$$A_2(x \otimes y \otimes z) = \rho(x) \otimes \rho(z) \otimes \rho(y)\,,$$
$$B_i(x \otimes y \otimes z) = \Phi_i(x) \otimes \Phi_i(y) \otimes \Phi_i(z), \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Then
(1) $A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2 \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{S})$;
(2) $\langle A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2 \rangle = \langle A_1, A_2 \rangle \times \langle B_1, B_2 \rangle$ and $\langle A_1, A_2 \rangle \cong \langle B_1, B_2 \rangle \cong S_3$.

Proof. First prove (2). Clearly, $A_1^3 = 1$ ($= \mathrm{id}_L$, where we denote $L = M_2^{\otimes 3}$). Notice that $\rho^2 = \mathrm{id}_{M_2}$, whence $A_2^2 = 1$. Further,

$$\begin{aligned}(A_2A_1A_2)(x \otimes y \otimes z) &= (A_2A_1)(\rho(x) \otimes \rho(z) \otimes \rho(y)) = A_2(\rho(z) \otimes \rho(y) \otimes \rho(x)) \\ &= z \otimes x \otimes y = A_1^{-1}(x \otimes y \otimes z),\end{aligned}$$

whence $A_2A_1A_2 = A_1^{-1}$. Hence $\langle A_1, A_2 \rangle \cong S_3$.

Next, T_1 and T_2 satisfy relations $T_1^3 = T_2^2 = 1$, $T_2T_1T_2 = T_1^{-1}$; it follows that Φ_1 and Φ_2, as well as B_1 and B_2, satisfy the same relations, and therefore generate a group isomorphic to S_3.

Since $\langle A_1, A_2\rangle \cong S_3$, each nontrivial element of $\langle A_1, A_2\rangle$ induces nontrivial permutation of the factors of the product $M_2 \otimes M_2 \otimes M_2$. On the other hand, $\langle B_1, B_2\rangle$ preserves each factor of the latter product. So $\langle A_1, A_2\rangle \cap \langle B_1, B_2\rangle = 1$.

It remains to prove that A_i and B_j commute for all i, j. The fact that A_1 commutes with both B_1 and B_2 is almost evident.

Next, it is easy to prove that ρ commutes with both Φ_1 and Φ_2. (Check this, for example, for Φ_1. Let $x = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$ be an arbitrary matrix. Then

$$\Phi_1(x) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} x \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} c+d & -c \\ -a-b+c+d & a-c \end{pmatrix},$$

whence

$$(\rho\Phi_1)(x) = \begin{pmatrix} a-c & c \\ a+b-c-d & c+d \end{pmatrix};$$

on the other hand, $\rho(x) = \begin{pmatrix} d & -b \\ -c & a \end{pmatrix}$, whence

$$(\Phi_1\rho)(x) = \begin{pmatrix} a-c & c \\ -d+b-c+a & d+c \end{pmatrix},$$

the same matrix. The similar checking for Φ_2 is even simpler.)

Now

$$(A_2B_i)(x \otimes y \otimes z) = A_2(\Phi_i(x) \otimes \Phi_i(y) \otimes \Phi_i(z)) = \rho(\Phi_i(x)) \otimes \rho(\Phi_i(z)) \otimes \rho(\Phi_i(y));$$

on the other hand,

$$(B_iA_2)(x \otimes y \otimes z) = B_i(\rho(x) \otimes \rho(z) \otimes \rho(y)) = \Phi_i(\rho(x)) \otimes \Phi_i(\rho(z)) \otimes \Phi_i(\rho(y)),$$

which is the same, because of $\rho\Phi_i = \Phi_i\rho$.

Thus, (2) is proved.

Now we prove (1).

First note that $\mathcal{S}$ is invariant under A_1. More precisely, $\mathcal{S}$ falls into three orbits

$$\mathcal{O}_0 = \{(e_{11}+e_{22}) \otimes (e_{11}+e_{22}) \otimes (e_{11}+e_{22})\} = \{\delta \otimes \delta \otimes \delta\},$$

where $\delta = e_{11} + e_{22} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$,

$$\mathcal{O}_1 = \{ \quad e_{11} \otimes (e_{12}+e_{22}) \otimes (e_{21}-e_{22}), \quad (e_{21}-e_{22}) \otimes e_{11} \otimes (e_{12}+e_{22}), \quad (e_{12}+e_{22}) \otimes (e_{21}-e_{22}) \otimes e_{11} \ \},$$

$$\mathcal{O}_2 = \{ \quad e_{22} \otimes (e_{11}+e_{21}) \otimes (-e_{11}+e_{12}), \quad (-e_{11}+e_{12}) \otimes e_{22} \otimes (e_{11}+e_{21}), \quad (e_{11}+e_{21}) \otimes (-e_{11}+e_{12}) \otimes e_{22} \ \}.$$

We call $\delta \otimes \delta \otimes \delta$ the *exceptional* element of $\mathcal{S}$, the other 6 elements are called *regular* ones. The set of regular elements of $\mathcal{S}$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{S}_0$.

Further, ρ takes matrices

$$e_{11} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad e_{12} + e_{22} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad e_{21} - e_{22} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

to

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = e_{22}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = e_{11} - e_{12}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = -e_{11} - e_{21}$$

respectively, so A_2 takes tensor

$$e_{11} \otimes (e_{12} + e_{22}) \otimes (e_{21} - e_{22}) \in \mathcal{O}_1$$

to

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(e_{11}) \otimes \rho(e_{21} - e_{22}) \otimes \rho(e_{12} + e_{22}) &= e_{22} \otimes (-e_{11} - e_{21}) \otimes (e_{11} - e_{12}) \\ &= e_{22} \otimes (e_{11} + e_{21}) \otimes (-e_{11} + e_{12}) \in \mathcal{O}_2\,. \end{aligned}$$

Since $A_2^2 = 1$ and A_2 normalizes $\langle A_1 \rangle$, it follows that A_2 interchanges the orbits $\mathcal{O}_1$ and $\mathcal{O}_2$. Therefore, $\langle A_1, A_2 \rangle$ preserves $\mathcal{O}_1 \cup \mathcal{O}_2$ (and, moreover, acts transitively on $\mathcal{O}_1 \cup \mathcal{O}_2$). It is also evident that A_2 preserves $\delta \otimes \delta \otimes \delta$. Thus, $\mathcal{S}$ is invariant under $\langle A_1, A_2 \rangle$.

It is obvious that δ is invariant under Φ_1 and Φ_2, whence $\delta \otimes \delta \otimes \delta$ is invariant under B_1 and B_2. Next, it is easy to calculate that Φ_1 takes matrices e_{11}, $e_{12} + e_{22}$ and $e_{21} - e_{22}$ to $-e_{21} + e_{22}$, e_{11} and $-e_{12} - e_{22}$, respectively, and Φ_2 takes them to e_{22}, $e_{11} + e_{21}$ and $-e_{11} + e_{12}$, respectively. So B_1 takes tensor $e_{11} \otimes (e_{12} + e_{22}) \otimes (e_{21} - e_{22})$ to

$$(-e_{21} + e_{22}) \otimes e_{11} \otimes (-e_{12} - e_{22}) = (e_{21} - e_{22}) \otimes e_{11} \otimes (e_{12} + e_{22}),$$

and B_2 takes the same tensor to $e_{22} \otimes (e_{11} + e_{21}) \otimes (-e_{11} + e_{12})$.

Both of these tensors are in $\mathcal{O}_1 \cup \mathcal{O}_2$. Taking into account that B_1 and B_2 commute with $\langle A_1, A_2 \rangle$ and that the action of $\langle A_1, A_2 \rangle$ on $\mathcal{O}_1 \cup \mathcal{O}_2$ is transitive, we see that both B_1 and B_2 preserve $\mathcal{O}_1 \cup \mathcal{O}_2$. □

Now we explain the origin of these automorphisms. First of all, one sees immediately that $\mathcal{S}$ is invariant under the cyclic shift (i.e., under A_1).

To construct the other automorphisms it is convenient to decompose the product $M_2 \otimes M_2 \otimes M_2$ further. Let $V = \langle e_1, e_2 \rangle$ be the two-dimensional space and $V^* = \langle e^1, e^2 \rangle$ be its dual space, $(e_i, e^j) = \delta_{ij}$. We identify M_2 with $V \otimes V^*$ by $e_{ij} \leftrightarrow e_i \otimes e^j$; then $M_2 \otimes M_2 \otimes M_2$ is identified with $V \otimes V^* \otimes V \otimes V^* \otimes V \otimes V^*$. Then $\mathcal{S}$ may be written as

$$\{e_1 \otimes e^1 \otimes (e_1 + e_2) \otimes e^2 \otimes e_2 \otimes (e^1 - e^2),\ e_1 \otimes (e^1 - e^2) \otimes e_2 \otimes e^2 \otimes (e_1 + e_2) \otimes (-e^1),$$

$$e_2 \otimes (e^1 - e^2) \otimes e_1 \otimes e^1 \otimes (e_1 + e_2) \otimes e^2,\ e_2 \otimes e^2 \otimes (e_1 + e_2) \otimes e^1 \otimes e_1 \otimes (-e^1 + e^2)\,,$$

$$(e_1 \otimes e^1 + e_2 \otimes e^2) \otimes (e_1 \otimes e^1 + e_2 \otimes e^2) \otimes (e_1 \otimes e^1 + e_2 \otimes e^2),\ (e_1 + e_2) \otimes e^1 \otimes e_1 \otimes (-e^1 + e^2) \otimes e_2 \otimes e^2,$$

$$(e_1 + e_2) \otimes e^2 \otimes e_2 \otimes (e^1 - e^2) \otimes e_1 \otimes e^1\ \}.$$

The exceptional element equals $\delta \otimes \delta \otimes \delta$, where $\delta = e_1 \otimes e^1 + e_2 \otimes e^2$ is the "identity tensor" of the space $V \otimes V^*$. Moreover, each regular element of $\mathcal{S}$ turns out to be decomposable, as an element of $(V \otimes V^*)^{\otimes 3}$.

Observe that for each regular element of $\mathcal{S}$ its V-factors are e_1, e_2 and e_1+e_2 (taken in various order and up to sign), and the V^*-factors are e^1, e^2 and e^1-e^2.

Moreover, it is easy to check that the regular elements of $\mathcal{S}$ are precisely the tensors of the form

$$x_1 \otimes x_2 \otimes x_3 \otimes x_4 \otimes x_5 \otimes x_6\,,$$

which satisfy the conditions

(1) $\{\langle x_1\rangle, \langle x_3\rangle, \langle x_5\rangle\} = \{\langle e_1\rangle, \langle e_2\rangle, \langle e_1+e_2\rangle\}$, and $\{\langle x_2\rangle, \langle x_4\rangle, \langle x_6\rangle\} = \{\langle e^1\rangle, \langle e^2\rangle, \langle e^1-e^2\rangle\}$;

(2) $(x_1, x_4) = (x_3, x_6) = (x_5, x_2) = 0$;

(3) $(x_1, x_2)(x_3, x_4)(x_5, x_6) = -1$.

Observe that the triples of one-dimensional subspaces $\{\langle e_1\rangle, \langle e_2\rangle, \langle e_1+e_2\rangle\}$ and $\{\langle e^1\rangle, \langle e^2\rangle, \langle e^1-e^2\rangle\}$ are dual in the following sense: the annihilator of an element of one of these triples is an element of the other triple.

Now let T be a linear transformation on V, preserving $\{\langle e_1\rangle, \langle e_2\rangle, \langle e_1+e_2\rangle\}$. Then the dual transformation T^* of V^* preserves $\{\langle e^1\rangle, \langle e^2\rangle, \langle e^1-e^2\rangle\}$. Moreover, it is evident that the transformation $\widetilde{T} = (T \otimes T^*)^{\otimes 3}$ preserves the set of tensors satisfying conditions (1), (2) and (3), i.e. it preserves $\mathcal{S}_0$. (It is clear also that $\widetilde{T}$ preserves the exceptional element of $\mathcal{S}$, because $T \otimes T^*$ preserves δ).

It is clear that if $T' = \lambda T$, where $\lambda \in K^*$, then $\widetilde{T'} = \widetilde{T}$. So $\widetilde{T}$ depends only on the permutation induced by T on $\{\langle e_1\rangle, \langle e_2\rangle, \langle e_1+e_2\rangle\}$. Taking as such a permutation a 3-cycle and a transposition on the latter set, we obtain transformations $B_1 = \widetilde{T_1}$ and $B_2 = \widetilde{T_2}$, described in the proposition 5.

Finally, to construct automorphism A_2 we first construct a Segre automorphism of the space $(V \otimes V^*)^{\otimes 3}$ that interchanges V- and V^*-factors, and such that the corresponding isomorphisms between V and V^* interchange triples $\{\langle e_1\rangle, \langle e_2\rangle, \langle e_1+e_2\rangle\}$ and $\{\langle e^1\rangle, \langle e^2\rangle, \langle e^1-e^2\rangle\}$. Namely, we define

$$\varphi : V \longrightarrow V^*, \quad \psi : V^* \longrightarrow V$$

by

$$\varphi : \quad e_1 \mapsto e^2, \quad e_2 \mapsto -e^1\,, \quad \text{(whence } e_1+e_2 \mapsto -e^1+e^2\text{)};$$
$$\psi : \quad e^1 \mapsto e_2, \quad e^2 \mapsto -e_1\,, \quad \text{(whence } e^1-e^2 \mapsto e_1+e_2\,\text{)}.$$

(thus, φ and ψ maps each of the one-dimensional subspaces $\langle e_1\rangle$, $\langle e_2\rangle$, $\langle e_1+e_2\rangle$, $\langle e^1\rangle$, $\langle e^2\rangle$, and $\langle e^1-e^2\rangle$ to its annihilator). Next, we put $\rho(x \otimes y) = \psi(y) \otimes \varphi(x)$. Then it is easy to see that $\rho(\delta) = \delta$. Now one can guess that the map defined by

$$x \otimes y \otimes z \mapsto \rho(x) \otimes \rho(z) \otimes \rho(y)$$

leaves the set of tensors satisfying (1),(2) and (3) invariant.

7. Additional symmetries. Observe that any element of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{S})$ is a Segre authomorphism not only with respect to the decomposition $M_2 \otimes M_2 \otimes M_2$, but with respect to the decomposition $V \otimes V^* \otimes V \otimes V^* \otimes V \otimes V^*$ also. There are, however, symmetries of the Strassen algorithm that are Segre authomorphisms with respect to $V \otimes V^* \otimes \ldots \otimes V^*$, but not with respect to $M_2 \otimes M_2 \otimes M_2$.

The origin of these symmetries, informally speaking, is the following. Denote by $\mathcal{S}_0$ the set of all regular elements of $\mathcal{S}$. Write the decomposition

$$S(2,2,2) = \delta \otimes \delta \otimes \delta + \sum \mathcal{S}_0\,, \tag{4}$$

where $\sum \mathcal{S}_0$ is the sum of all elements of $\mathcal{S}_0$.

But the tensors $S(2,2,2)$ and $\delta\otimes\delta\otimes\delta$ are actually of the same kind, in the following sense. Let (i_1,i_2,i_3) be any permutation of $(2,4,6)$. Then $\{\{1,i_1\},\{3,i_2\},\{5,i_3\}\}$ is a partition of the set $\{1,2,3,4,5,6\}$ into pairs such that every pair contains an even number and an odd one (and, conversely, any such partition can be obtained in the described way). The partititon $\{\{1,i_1\},\{3,i_2\},\{5,i_3\}\}$ determines a partition in pairs of the form $\{V,V^*\}$ of the factors of the product $V\otimes V^*\otimes\ldots\otimes V^*$. Next, we take in each of the three factors $V\otimes V^*$ the identity tensor δ, and form the product of these three tensors. The tensor obtained in this way we denote by $t_{i_1i_2i_3}$. For example,

$$\begin{aligned} t_{462} &= e_1\otimes e^1\otimes e_1\otimes e^1\otimes e_1\otimes e^1 + e_1\otimes e^2\otimes e_1\otimes e^1\otimes e_2\otimes e^1 \\ &+ e_1\otimes e^1\otimes e_2\otimes e^1\otimes e_1\otimes e^2 + e_1\otimes e^2\otimes e_2\otimes e^1\otimes e_2\otimes e^2 \\ &+ e_2\otimes e^1\otimes e_1\otimes e^2\otimes e_1\otimes e^1 + e_2\otimes e^2\otimes e_1\otimes e^2\otimes e_2\otimes e^1 \\ &+ e_2\otimes e^1\otimes e_2\otimes e^2\otimes e_1\otimes e^2 + e_2\otimes e^2\otimes e_2\otimes e^2\otimes e_2\otimes e^2\,. \end{aligned}$$

Then, clearly, $\delta\otimes\delta\otimes\delta$ is nothing else but t_{246}. Moreover,

$$S(2,2,2)=\sum_{i,j,k=1,2} e_{ij}\otimes e_{jk}\otimes e_{ki}=\sum_{i,j,k=1,2} e_i\otimes e^j\otimes e_j\otimes e^k\otimes e_k\otimes e^i=t_{624}.$$

Thus, we see that the tensors $S(2,2,2)$ and $\delta\otimes\delta\otimes\delta$ are of the same kind indeed and differ only in permutation of factors.

Now we give a formal definition. The *extended Strassen algorithm* is the set

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}=\{-S(2,2,2),\delta\otimes\delta\otimes\delta\}\cup\mathcal{S}_0\,.$$

(Note that the sum of the elements of $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}$ is the zero tensor). An *authomorphism* of $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}$ is a Segre authomorphism of $V\otimes V^*\otimes\ldots\otimes V^*$ that leaves $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}$ invariant.

Proposition 6 *Let $T_i\in GL(V)$, $T_i^*\in GL(V^*)$, $\varphi: V\longrightarrow V^*$ and $\psi: V^*\longrightarrow V$ be defined by*

$$T_1\,:\,e_1\mapsto e_2,\quad e_2\mapsto -e_1-e_2\,;\quad T_1^*\,:\,e^1\mapsto -e^1+e^2,\quad e^2\mapsto -e^1\,;$$
$$T_2\,:\,e_1\mapsto e_2,\quad e_2\mapsto e_1\,;\quad T_2^*\,:\,e^1\mapsto e^2,\quad e^2\mapsto e^1\,;$$
$$\varphi\,:\,e_1\mapsto e^2,\quad e_2\mapsto -e^1;\quad \psi\,:\,e^1\mapsto e_2,\quad e^2\mapsto -e_1\,.$$

Let $\widetilde{A}_2$, $\widetilde{A}_3$, $\widetilde{B}_1$, $\widetilde{B}_2$ be Segre authomorphisms of the product $V\otimes V^*\otimes V\otimes V^*\otimes V\otimes V^*$ defined by

$$\widetilde{A}_2(x_1\otimes y_1\otimes x_2\otimes y_2\otimes x_3\otimes y_3)=\psi(y_1)\otimes\varphi(x_1)\otimes\psi(y_3)\otimes\varphi(x_3)\otimes\psi(y_2)\otimes\varphi(x_2),$$

$$\widetilde{A}_3(x_1\otimes y_1\otimes x_2\otimes y_2\otimes x_3\otimes y_3)=-x_1\otimes y_3\otimes x_3\otimes y_2\otimes x_2\otimes y_1\,,$$

$$\widetilde{B}_i(x_1\otimes y_1\otimes x_2\otimes y_2\otimes x_3\otimes y_3)=T_i(x_1)\otimes T_i^*(y_1)\otimes T_i(x_2)\otimes T_i^*(y_2)\otimes T_i(x_3)\otimes T_i^*(y_3),\quad i=1,2.$$

Then

(1) $\langle\widetilde{A}_2,\widetilde{A}_3,\widetilde{B}_1,\widetilde{B}_2\rangle=\langle\widetilde{A}_2,\widetilde{A}_3\rangle\times\langle\widetilde{B}_1,\widetilde{B}_2\rangle$, $\langle\widetilde{A}_2,\widetilde{A}_3\rangle\cong D_{12}$ (the dihedral group of order 12), and $\langle\widetilde{B}_1,\widetilde{B}_2\rangle\cong S_3$;

(2) $\widetilde{A}_2,\widetilde{A}_3,\widetilde{B}_1,\widetilde{B}_2\in\mathrm{Aut}(\widetilde{\mathcal{S}})$.

Proof. We use results of Proposition 5. Identify $V \otimes V^* \otimes \ldots \otimes V^*$ with $M_2 \otimes M_2 \otimes M_2$. Then $\widetilde{B}_1$, $\widetilde{B}_2$ and $\widetilde{A}_2$ correspond to B_1, B_2 and A_2 of Proposition 5. So $\langle \widetilde{B}_1, \widetilde{B}_2 \rangle \cong S_3$, $\widetilde{A}_2^2 = 1_L$ and $\widetilde{B}_1$, $\widetilde{B}_2$ commute with $\widetilde{A}_2$. Next, it is almost evident that $\widetilde{A}_3$ commutes with $\widetilde{B}_1$ and $\widetilde{B}_2$. So the subgroups $\langle \widetilde{A}_2, \widetilde{A}_3 \rangle$ and $\langle \widetilde{B}_1, \widetilde{B}_2 \rangle$ commute elementwise.

Note that φ and ψ are inverse to each other, up to -1: $\psi\varphi = -1_V$, $\varphi\psi = -1_{V^*}$.

It is clear that $\widetilde{A}_3^2 = 1_L$.

Consider the product $\widetilde{A}_2\widetilde{A}_3$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}(\widetilde{A}_2\widetilde{A}_3)(x_1 \otimes y_1 \otimes x_2 \otimes y_2 \otimes x_3 \otimes y_3) &= \widetilde{A}_2(-x_1 \otimes y_3 \otimes x_3 \otimes y_2 \otimes x_2 \otimes y_1) \\ &= -\psi(y_3) \otimes \varphi(x_1) \otimes \psi(y_1) \otimes \varphi(x_2) \otimes \psi(y_2) \otimes \varphi(x_3),\end{aligned}$$

whence

$$\begin{aligned}&(\widetilde{A}_2\widetilde{A}_3)^2(x_1 \otimes y_1 \otimes x_2 \otimes y_2 \otimes x_3 \otimes y_3) \\ &= \psi\varphi(x_3) \otimes \varphi\psi(y_3) \otimes \psi\varphi(x_1) \otimes \varphi\psi(y_1) \otimes \psi\varphi(x_2) \otimes \varphi\psi(y_2) \\ &= (-x_3) \otimes (-y_3) \otimes (-x_1) \otimes (-y_1) \otimes (-x_2) \otimes (-y_2) \\ &= x_3 \otimes y_3 \otimes x_1 \otimes y_1 \otimes x_2 \otimes y_2.\end{aligned}$$

Set $\widetilde{A}_1 = (\widetilde{A}_2\widetilde{A}_3)^2$. Then $\widetilde{A}_1^3 = 1$, whence $(\widetilde{A}_2\widetilde{A}_3)^6 = 1$. It is also obvious that $\widetilde{A}_1$ corresponds to A_1^{-1} under the identification described above.

The transformations $\widetilde{A}_2$ and $\widetilde{A}_3$ satisfy the defining relations of the group D_{12}, so $\langle \widetilde{A}_2, \widetilde{A}_3 \rangle$ is a homomorphic image of D_{12}. On the other hand, the group of permutations of the factors of the product $V \otimes V^* \otimes \ldots \otimes V^*$, induced by $\langle \widetilde{A}_2, \widetilde{A}_3 \rangle$, is isomorphic to D_{12}. So $\langle \widetilde{A}_2, \widetilde{A}_3 \rangle \cong D_{12}$, and moreover 1 is the only element of $\langle \widetilde{A}_2, \widetilde{A}_3 \rangle$ that induces the trivial permutation of the factors. Since $\langle \widetilde{B}_1, \widetilde{B}_2 \rangle$ preserves each factor, it follows that $\langle \widetilde{A}_2, \widetilde{A}_3 \rangle \cap \langle \widetilde{B}_1, \widetilde{B}_2 \rangle = 1$, whence

$$\langle \widetilde{A}_2, \widetilde{A}_3, \widetilde{B}_1, \widetilde{B}_2 \rangle = \langle \widetilde{A}_2, \widetilde{A}_3, \rangle \times \langle \widetilde{B}_1, \widetilde{B}_2 \rangle.$$

Thus, (1) is proved. Prove (2).

The transformations $\widetilde{B}_1$, $\widetilde{B}_2$ and $\widetilde{A}_2$ preserve $\mathcal{S}$ by Proposition 5 and the identification. So they preserve $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}$ also. Next, observe that $\widetilde{A}_3$ takes element

$$e_1 \otimes e^1 \otimes (e_1 + e_2) \otimes e^2 \otimes e_2 \otimes (e^1 - e^2) \in \mathcal{S}_0$$

to

$$-e_1 \otimes (e^1 - e^2) \otimes e_2 \otimes e^2 \otimes (e_1 + e_2) \otimes e^1 \in \mathcal{S}_0\,.$$

Taking into account that $\widetilde{A}_3$ commutes with $\langle \widetilde{B}_1, \widetilde{B}_2 \rangle$ and that $\langle \widetilde{B}_1, \widetilde{B}_2 \rangle$ is transitive on $\mathcal{S}_0$, we see that $\widetilde{A}_3$ leaves $\mathcal{S}_0$ invariant.

Finally, it is easy to see that $\widetilde{A}_3$ interchanges $-S(2,2,2)$ and $\delta \otimes \delta \otimes \delta$. Thus, $\widetilde{A}_3$ preserves $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}$. □

8. The full authomorphism groups of $\mathcal{S}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}$. In this paragraph we show that the authomorphism groups for $\mathcal{S}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}$, described in Propositions 5 and 6, are actually the full authomorphism groups $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{S})$ and $\mathrm{Aut}(\widetilde{\mathcal{S}})$.

First observe the following. Let $U \otimes V$ be the tensor product of two spaces, and let $L \subseteq U \otimes V$ be a subspace. Then there exists the least subspace $X \subseteq U$ such that $L \subseteq X \otimes V$. We

call this X the *quasiprojection* of L, and we use notation $X = \mathrm{qpr}_U(L)$. The quasiprojection can be easily found. Namely, let $x_1, \dots, x_l \in L$ be a basis of L, $v_1, \dots, v_n$ be a basis of V, and let $u_{ij} \in U$, where $1 \le i \le l$, $1 \le j \le n$, be the elements such that $x_i = \sum_{1 \le j \le n} u_{ij} \otimes v_j$. Then

$$\mathrm{qpr}_U(L) = \langle u_{ij} \mid 1 \le i \le l,\ 1 \le j \le n \rangle.$$

If $t \in U \otimes V$ is a decomposable tensor, then $\mathrm{qpr}_U(\langle t \rangle)$ is a one-dimensional subspace. Generally, if $L = \langle t \rangle$ is a one-dimensional subspace, then $\dim \mathrm{qpr}_U(\langle t \rangle) = \mathrm{rk}(t)$. Moreover, for any two subspaces $L_1, L_2 \subseteq U \otimes V$ we have $\mathrm{qpr}_U(L_1 + L_2) = \mathrm{qpr}_U(L_1) + \mathrm{qpr}_U(L_2)$.

Below we need a simple lemma, whose proof is left to the reader.

Lemma 7 *Let V be a space over an infinite field K and let $L_1, \dots, L_l \subseteq V$ be one-dimensional subspaces. Suppose that $\langle L_1, \dots, L_l \rangle = V$ and that there is no partititon $\{L_1, \dots, L_l\} = A \sqcup B$ such that $\langle A \rangle \cap \langle B \rangle = 0$. Let $\varphi \in GL(V)$ be a linear transformation such that $\varphi(L_i) = L_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, l$. Then $\varphi = \lambda E$ is a multiplication by a scalar.* □

Proposition 8 *Let $H = \langle A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2 \rangle$ be the subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{S})$ described in Proposition 5. Then $H = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{S})$.*

Proof. Let $L = M_2 \otimes M_2 \otimes M_2$; denote the factors by X_1, X_2, X_3:

$$L = M_2 \otimes M_2 \otimes M_2 = X_1 \otimes X_2 \otimes X_3\,.$$

Let $N \subseteq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{S})$ be the subgroup of all elements that preserve each factor. We know from Proposition 5 (and its proof) that any permutation of factors is induced by a suitable element of $\langle A_1\,, A_2 \rangle$, and that the latter subgroup acts on $\{X_1\,, X_2\,, X_3\}$ exactly; on the other hand, $\langle B_1\,, B_2 \rangle$ preserves each factor. So it is sufficient (and necessary) to prove that $N = \langle B_1\,, B_2 \rangle$.

We number the elements of $\mathcal{S}$ as follows:

$$s_1 = e_{11} \otimes (e_{12} + e_{22}) \otimes (e_{21} - e_{22}), \quad s_2 = (-e_{11} + e_{12}) \otimes e_{22} \otimes (e_{11} + e_{21}),$$

$$s_3 = (e_{21} - e_{22}) \otimes e_{11} \otimes (e_{12} + e_{22}), \quad s_4 = e_{22} \otimes (e_{11} + e_{21}) \otimes (-e_{11} + e_{12}),$$

$$s_5 = (e_{11} + e_{21}) \otimes (-e_{11} + e_{12}) \otimes e_{22}\,, \quad s_6 = (e_{12} + e_{22}) \otimes (e_{21} - e_{22}) \otimes e_{11}\,,$$

$$s_7 = (e_{11} + e_{22}) \otimes (e_{11} + e_{22}) \otimes (e_{11} + e_{22})\ (= \delta \otimes \delta \otimes \delta).$$

Evidently, N induces a subgroup, which will be denoted by N_i, of the projective group $PGL(X_i)$.

Let C be the set of quasiprojections of elements of $\mathcal{S}$ to X_1:

$$C = \{\mathrm{qpr}_{X_1}(\langle x \rangle) \mid x \in \mathcal{S}\}.$$

It is obvious that N_1 preserves C. We can write C explicitly: $C = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_7\}$, where $r_1 = \langle e_{11} \rangle$, $r_2 = \langle e_{11} - e_{12} \rangle$, $r_3 = \langle e_{21} - e_{22} \rangle$, $r_4 = \langle e_{22} \rangle$, $r_5 = \langle e_{11} + e_{21} \rangle$, $r_6 = \langle e_{12} + e_{22} \rangle$, and $r_7 = \langle e_{11} + e_{22} \rangle$.

We say that a set of subspaces $L_1, \dots, L_t$ of a vector space is *independent*, if $\langle L_1, \dots, L_t \rangle = L_1 \oplus \dots \oplus L_t$; otherwise it is *dependent*. The following three triples of subspaces r_i are dependent: $\{r_1, r_4, r_7\}$, $\{r_2, r_6, r_7\}$, $\{r_3, r_5, r_7\}$. Any other triple $\{r_i, r_j, r_k\}$ is independent.

Clearly, N_1 permutes subspaces r_i and preserves the dependency relation. So N_1 fixes r_7 and preserves the set of three pairs $\{r_1, r_4\}$, $\{r_2, r_6\}$, and $\{r_3, r_5\}$. It follows that N fixes s_7 and preserves $\{\{s_1, s_4\}, \{s_2, s_6\}, \{s_3, s_5\}\}$. Similarly one can prove, considering quasiprojections to X_2 and X_3, that N preserves $\{\{s_1, s_5\}, \{s_2, s_3\}, \{s_4, s_6\}\}$ and $\{\{s_1, s_2\}, \{s_3, s_4\}, \{s_5, s_6\}\}$.

Let Φ_1 and Φ_2 be the transformations described in Proposition 5, and $\overline{\Phi}_i$ be their images in the projective group. Then $\overline{\Phi}_{1,2}$ permute pairs $\{r_1, r_4\}$, $\{r_2, r_6\}$, and $\{r_3, r_5\}$ as follows:

$$\overline{\Phi}_1 : \ \{r_1, r_4\} \mapsto \{r_2, r_6\} \mapsto \{r_3, r_5\} \mapsto \{r_1, r_4\},$$

$$\overline{\Phi}_2 : \ \{r_1, r_4\} \mapsto \{r_1, r_4\}, \quad \{r_2, r_6\} \leftrightarrow \{r_3, r_5\}.$$

Therefore, any permutation of $\{\{r_1, r_4\}, \{r_2, r_6\}, \{r_3, r_5\}\}$ is induced by an element of $\langle \overline{\Phi}_1, \overline{\Phi}_2 \rangle$. So any permutation of the set of three pairs $\{\{s_1, s_4\}, \{s_2, s_6\}, \{s_3, s_5\}\}$ is induced by an element of $\langle B_1, B_2 \rangle$.

Now we can prove the proposition. Let $g \in N$, and let $g_1 \in \langle B_1, B_2 \rangle$ be an element such that the permutations of $\{\{s_1, s_4\}, \{s_2, s_6\}, \{s_3, s_5\}\}$, induced by g and g_1, coincide. Then the element $g_2 = g_1^{-1} g$ is in N, preserves each of the three pairs $\{s_1, s_4\}$, $\{s_2, s_6\}$, and $\{s_3, s_5\}$, and, moreover, leaves invariant two sets $\{\{s_1, s_5\}, \{s_2, s_3\}, \{s_4, s_6\}\}$ and $\{\{s_1, s_2\}, \{s_3, s_4\}, \{s_5, s_6\}\}$. It easily follows that g_2 fixes each s_i. Now let $i = 1, 2$ or 3, and let h_i be the image of g_2 in $PGL(X_i)$. Then h_i preserves each of the subspaces $r_1, \ldots, r_7$, whence $h_i = 1$ by Lemma 7. Therefore g_2 is a scalar also. Since g_2 preserves $S(2, 2, 2)$, it follows that $g_2 = 1$, so $g = g_1 \in \langle B_1, B_2 \rangle$. □

Proposition 9 *Let $H = \langle \widetilde{A}_2, \widetilde{A}_3, \widetilde{B}_1, \widetilde{B}_2 \rangle$ be the subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\widetilde{\mathcal{S}})$ described in Proposition 6. Then $H = \mathrm{Aut}(\widetilde{\mathcal{S}})$.*

Proof. We give a sketch of a proof, leaving some details to the reader.

Number the factors of the product $V \otimes V^* \otimes \ldots \otimes V^*$ as

$$V \otimes V^* \otimes V \otimes V^* \otimes V \otimes V^* = X_1 \otimes X_2 \otimes X_3 \otimes X_4 \otimes X_5 \otimes X_6 \,.$$

We have $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}} = \{u_1, u_2\} \cup \mathcal{S}_0$, where $u_1 = -S(2, 2, 2)$ and $u_2 = \delta^{\otimes 3}$. Observe that for $t \in \mathcal{S}_0$ the quasiprojection $\mathrm{qpr}_{X_i}(\langle t \rangle)$ is of dimension 1, for all $i = 1, \ldots, 6$. On the other hand, if $t \in \{u_1, u_2\}$, then $\mathrm{qpr}_{X_i}(\langle t \rangle) = X_i$. Hence $\mathrm{Aut}(\widetilde{\mathcal{S}})$ leaves $\{u_1, u_2\}$ invariant.

Let $1 \le i \ne j \le 6$. It is easy to see that $\mathrm{qpr}_{X_i \otimes X_j}(\langle \delta \otimes \delta \otimes \delta \rangle)$ is one-dimensional if $\{i, j\} = \{1, 2\}$, $\{3, 4\}$ or $\{5, 6\}$, and is equal to the full space $X_i \otimes X_j$ otherwise. Similarly the quasiprojection $\mathrm{qpr}_{X_i \otimes X_j}(\langle S(2, 2, 2) \rangle)$ is one-dimensional if $\{i, j\} = \{2, 3\}$, $\{4, 5\}$ or $\{1, 6\}$ and is equal to $X_i \otimes X_j$ otherwise. It follows that if $g \in \mathrm{Aut}(\widetilde{\mathcal{S}})$ and π is a permutation of $\{1, \ldots, 6\}$ (or, more precisely, of $\{X_1, \ldots, X_6\}$), induced by g, then π preserves the set of six pairs $\{\{1, 2\}, \{2, 3\}, \{3, 4\}, \{4, 5\}, \{5, 6\}, \{6, 1\}\}$. Therefore $\pi \in D$, where $D \cong D_{12}$ is the group of permutations of $\{1, \ldots, 6\}$ that preserve or invert the cyclic order $(1, 2, \ldots, 6)$.

Note, however, that any element of D is induced by an element of $\langle \widetilde{A}_2, \widetilde{A}_3 \rangle$. Hence $\mathrm{Aut}(\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}) = N \langle \widetilde{A}_2, \widetilde{A}_3 \rangle$, where $N \le \mathrm{Aut}(\widetilde{\mathcal{S}})$ is the subgroup of all elements preserving each X_i. So it is sufficient to prove that $N = \langle \widetilde{B}_1, \widetilde{B}_2 \rangle$.

Let $g \in N$, $g = g_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes g_6$, $g_i \in GL(X_i)$ (note that g_i is determined up to multiplication by a scalar). Obviously, g_1 preserves the set of quasiprojections

$$C = \{\mathrm{qpr}_{X_1}(\langle t \rangle) \mid t \in \mathcal{S}_0\}.$$

This C consists of three subspaces $\langle e_1\rangle$, $\langle e_2\rangle$, $\langle e_1+e_2\rangle$. For any permutation π of C there exists an element $h\in\langle\widetilde{B}_1,\widetilde{B}_2\rangle$, $h=h_1\otimes\ldots\otimes h_6$ such that h_1 acts on C by π. Therefore, there exist elements $x=x_1\otimes\ldots\otimes x_6\in N$ and $h\in\langle\widetilde{B}_1,\widetilde{B}_2\rangle$ such that $g=xh$ and x_1 acts on C trivially. So it is sufficient to show that if $x=x_1\otimes\ldots\otimes x_6\in N$ and x_1 acts on C trivially, then $x=1$.

Since x_1 fixes each of the three spaces $\langle e_1\rangle$, $\langle e_2\rangle$, and $\langle e_1+e_2\rangle$, we see that x_1 is a scalar. Next, since x preserves $\{u_1,u_2\}$, the quasiprojection of $\langle u_1\rangle$ to $X_1\otimes X_2$ is $X_1\otimes X_2$, and the quasiprojection of $\langle u_2\rangle$ to this factor is one-dimensional, it follows that $xu_1=u_1$ and $xu_2=u_2$. In particular, $x(\delta\otimes\delta\otimes\delta)=\delta\otimes\delta\otimes\delta$. Hence $(x_1\otimes x_2)\delta=\lambda\delta$, where $\lambda\in K^*$. So x_1 and x_2 are dual maps, up to multiplication by a scalar. Similarly $x_4=x_3^*$ and $x_6=x_5^*$ up to scalar. Furthermore, as x preserves $u_1=-S(2,2,2)$, we see that $x_3=x_2^*$, $x_5=x_4^*$, and $x_6=x_1^*$, up to scalar. Therefore, $x_1=x_3=x_5$ (up to scalar) and $x_2=x_4=x_6=x_1^*$. Since x_1 is a scalar, the other x_i are scalars also, whence $x=\mu$ is a scalar. Finally, since $xu_1=u_1$ and $u_1\neq 0$, we get $\mu=1$, that is $x=1$. □

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank A.E.Zalesskii, A.S.Kleshchev and Pham Huu Tiep for their friendly support during my work on this text.

References

[1] V.Strassen, Gaussian elimination is not optimal, Numer.Math. 13(1969), 354–356.

[2] J.M.Landsberg, Geometry and the complexity of matrix multiplication, Bull. AMS 45(2008), no.2, 247–284.

[3] M.Bläser, Complexity of bilinear problems (lecture notes by F.Bendun), http://www-cc.cs.uni-saarland.de/ teaching/SS09/ComplexityofBilinearProblems/script.pdf, 2009.

[4] V.Strassen, Asymptotic spectrum and matrix multiplication, ISSAC 2012; see /mathe.uni-konstanz.de.

[5] S.Winograd, On multiplication of 2×2 matrices, Linear Algebra Appl. 4 (1971), 381–388.

[6] Valery B.Alexeev, On the complexity of some algorithms of matrix multiplication, J.Algorithms 6(1985), no.1, 71–85.

[7] V.B.Alexeev, A.V.Smirnov, On exact and approximate complexities of multiplication of matrices of sizes 4×2 and 2×2, In: Contemporary problems of mathematics 17 (2013), 135–152. (in Russian)

[8] J.E.Hopcroft, L.R.Kerr, On minimizing the number of multiplications necessary for matrix multiplication, SIAM J. Appl. Math. 20 (1971), 20–36.

[9] Markus Bläser, On the complexity of the multiplication of matrices of small formats, J.Complexity 19(2003), 43–60.

[10] J.Laderman, A noncommutative algorithm for multiplying 3×3 matrices using 23 multiplications, Bull. AMS 82(1976), 180–182.

[11] H.F. de Groote, On the varieties of optimal algorithms for the computation of bilinear mappings. I. The isotropy group of a bilinear mapping, Theor. Comput.Sci. 7 (1978), 1–24. II. Optimal algorithms for 2×2 matrix multiplication, (the same journal issue), 127–148.

[12] A.I.Kostrikin, Yu.I.Manin, Linear Algebra and Geometry, 2nd ed., Moscow 1986 (in Russian).